No. 326

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

8th December, 1948

EIGHTEEN MONTHS AGO (C.N-L. 291) we discussed in these pages the first report of the Central Advisory Council for England and Wales, and in particular a chapter called "The Moral Factor in Education". After agreeing that the old patterns of morality were breaking down and that the words "right" and "wrong" had ceased to have meaning for large numbers of people, the Council had to admit its inability to find agreement on "the basic convictions on which the teaching of moral standards is to rest". It pointed out that, on the one hand, there are those for whom "the Christian beliefs which in the past supported our moral teaching no longer make sense, although the moral values still make a strong appeal", and, on the other hand, there are those who assert that "if our moral standards are to be maintained, it is essential to preserve Christian beliefs". It is not out of place to go back to this chapter, which is still a subject of lively debate, before embarking on the real subject of this News-Letter, which is the way in which the provisions of the 1944 Education Act for religious instruction and religious worship in schools are working themselves out in practice. We are not setting out to write an authoritative detailed report, but, as on many other subjects, we have had the most willing help of a number of persons who are personally concerned and who have put their knowledge and experience at our disposal.

NEWS-LETTER

THE TEACHING OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE IN STATE SCHOOLS

SUPPLEMENT

A PRELIMINARY REPLY TO DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR

BY

KARL BARTH

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

On the whole it is possible to say that steady progress is being made, that more teachers are being trained to teach religious knowledge, that the standard of teaching is going up, that interest is waxing rather than waning—all things which most Christians would be disposed to regard as encouraging. It is not just out of a captious desire to provide wet blankets or to disparage the hard labours of those who are responsible for this progress, that we begin by going back to what the Central Advisory Council said. We do so because in our view the most important question is the one which that Council raised— not " How much do people know about the Bible and the Christian faith ? " but, " In our confused society can the schools do anything about the question of a faith to live by ? "

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN STATE EDUCATION

The 1944 Education Act provides that " the school day in every county school and in every voluntary school shall begin with collective worship on the part of all pupils ". It also states that " religious instruction shall be given in every county school and in every voluntary school ". There is nothing revolutionary in either of these clauses. Collective worship has been customary in the great majority of schools, and there has never been an Education Act which did not refer to religious instruction. The Act further lays down that the teaching in all schools, primary and secondary alike, is to be on the basis of an agreed syllabus drawn up by committees appointed by the Local Education Authorities, on which are to be represented the Authority, the Churches and the teachers. This means that the instruction given is to be instruction in Christianity and not instruction in comparative religion, moral principles, or the duties of citizenship. Local Authorities are also empowered by the Act to set up standing Advisory Councils on religious education, to give advice on the methods of teaching, the choice of books and the provision of lectures for teachers.

The effect of the Act has been to set in train a number of administrative decisions and to quicken the pace of the improvement in teaching which has been going on slowly for some years.

To deal first with the matter of the agreed syllabus: some thirty of these were in use before the war. They were for use in elementary schools and did not, therefore, go above the age of fourteen. Since the Act most of these syllabuses have been overhauled and improved, and a few new ones have come into the picture. The best of these syllabuses provide the teacher not only with a curriculum but with a quarry of valuable material and an extensive bibliography. The more modern syllabuses are far richer in content than the early ones: there has been a tendency steadily to move away from a conception of religious instruction as teaching biblical history, the stories of the Old Testament, the Kings of Israel, the journeyings of St. Paul, towards a rounded teaching of the Christian faith based upon the Bible and containing the great doctrines of Christian belief (including in some syllabuses the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds), some Church history and teaching on Christian moral standards. An agreed syllabus must be non-sectarian. A surprising number of people seem to think this means "non-doctrinal", and may have been encouraged in this view by some of the earliest examples of an agreed syllabus. They would find a marked contrast in, for example, the Durham syllabus, or in the new London syllabus with its admirable introduction by the Bishop of Bristol. Some dioceses have selected an agreed syllabus for use in Church schools, adding specific Church teaching to it. The door is wide open on the basis of the agreed syllabus for doctrinal Christian teaching in state schools, in so far as the Anglican and Free Churches are agreed upon the main doctrines of belief.

Some Local Authorities have taken action to try to make the compulsory act of worship meaningful and dignified. With a few exceptions this provision of the Act has been accepted graciously in the schools, but difficulties often arise from the cramped conditions in which the assembly has to be held (in many a primary school the hall is not much more than an enlarged passage-way), and sometimes from the lack of knowledge on the part of teachers as to how to construct an act of worship. A number of handbooks were

published in past years, and now many Local Authorities are spending time and a considerable amount of money on excellently produced books for school worship, an enterprise in which the Oxford University Press has played a notable part.

The heart of the matter lies, however, not in the syllabus but in the teacher. Little can be done unless there are enough teachers who want to teach the subject, who can be trained to a sufficiently high standard to enable them to make the proper use of a good syllabus, and who can find as the years go on help which will deepen their knowledge and maintain their interest. The first is the basic question, " Are teachers interested ? " The first piece of evidence comes from the emergency training colleges set up since the war, in which the average age of men students is twenty-seven or twenty-eight instead of nineteen. Here there is reported to be a high proportion of men who are prepared to consider the classical statements of the Christian faith in relation also to what they have experienced from life. Ordinary training colleges are only now getting into full stride after the war. There has always been a good tradition in them : of the eighty colleges in this country before the war, only one did not have daily worship. Nearly half of these eighty are religious foundations and, therefore, give a considerable amount of time to religious knowledge, and the rest have always provided courses in religious knowledge or instruction in methods of scripture teaching.

In 1945 an important new step was taken. It was made possible for a student to offer religious knowledge as a subject in the teachers' Certificate, either at the advanced or at the ordinary standard. For the most part the Authorities and the colleges have gladly accepted the new status given to religious knowledge in the syllabus, though they have not always been able to find good tutors. Last year about five per cent of the students in training colleges offered religious knowledge at the advanced standard and about twenty-five per cent at the ordinary standard. In addition to this, the colleges provided courses for all teachers destined for junior schools, since in these schools the teaching of scripture is

in the hands of form teachers. The figures just quoted are high when it is remembered how many subjects a student has to choose from. There is some uncertainty, however, about how matters will develop in the next few years. Training colleges are now being grouped into areas, most of them based upon a university, and the teaching policy of the colleges will be in the hands of an Institute or Department of Education, normally but not necessarily under the Professor of Education in the university. The Institutes will seek in religious knowledge as in other subjects to improve the standard of teaching in the training colleges. But one or two of the Institutes have already, in order to improve the standard of the subjects studied, reduced the number of subjects in which an examination will be sat for the Certificate from four to two. This means that a number of students who are quite prepared to make religious knowledge one of four or three subjects will not choose it as one of two. The number of teachers emerging from training colleges with qualifications in religious knowledge, which has gone up steeply from year to year since 1945, may now go down again. This would be a grave set-back, for already Local Education Authorities are asking for more teachers qualified to give religious instruction than are available.

When we turn to the training of teachers for grammar schools, what happens in the universities is of cardinal importance. In most universities an honours degree in theology is designed to meet the needs of candidates for the ministry (or, some would say, of that small percentage of them who become teachers of theology) and is not suited to the needs of teachers or, indeed, to any other type of layman. Some universities provide courses in biblical knowledge, conferring a certificate. More recently certain universities have provided for religious knowledge to be included in the honours degree course.

An important field is that of helping teachers who already teach the subject to do it better. The Ministry of Education has assumed a responsibility for providing courses in religious knowledge, delegating the organization of them to the Institute of Christian Education. Since its foundation

in 1935 the Institute has helped teachers, either directly from its own office or through its regional branches, to study and to improve the standard of religious teaching. These courses, held over the past six years, have been very well attended. One of the main impressions left on teachers is that religious knowledge is a far richer and more interesting field than they had suspected. The lecturing is first-rate, and tutoring in groups helps to elucidate many difficulties.

We now come to the question, " What is actually going on in the schools and has there been any change ? " The elementary schools were, of course, for many years a battle ground between the Churches. An uneasy truce was established by making religious knowledge compulsorily the first or last teaching period in the day, to facilitate the withdrawal of some pupils. The feuds have died down, and since the 1944 Act there has been freedom to put divinity at any time in the day, so that if there is a trained person on the staff he or she may move from class to class. So far few schools take advantage of this provision, mainly from lack of staff, but where the reorganization of schools under the provisions of the Act is well advanced a reduced number of teachers of greater competence is being used to teach religious knowledge.

The grammar schools are in better case. Their history has never been bedevilled by controversy. They usually have better buildings and, for this reason, in most cases a more dignified tradition of school worship. One interesting feature is the very marked superiority of the teaching of religious knowledge in girls' schools over that in boys' schools. The Lambeth Diploma and such institutions as St. Christopher's College giving women opportunities for theological study at a high standard are mainly responsible. In the grammar school time is the big problem. In very few schools is more than one forty-minute period a week given to religious knowledge. In about half the grammar schools there has been no religious instruction beyond the age of fifteen. When the 1944 Act is fully operating it is thought that religious instruction will be given in all upper forms. Since the Act, religious knowledge has been in-

spected. The number of candidates offering religious knowledge in the school leaving certificate has been steadily rising : it is now third among all subjects in the number of candidates. Cynics may think that it is offered as a soft option ; those who do in fact offer it as a subject for an easy pass may be disappointed to discover that the proportion of failures is as high as in any other subject.

There are many, including all Roman Catholics and many Anglicans, who are sure that teaching on the basis of an agreed syllabus is no substitute for the Church school, where religious knowledge is directed to the end of Church membership and where the atmosphere of the school, if it is a good one, is that of a Christian community. The effect of the 1944 Act will be to reduce the number of Church schools. The Church of England faces not only a very heavy financial outlay, but the need for thinking out how to make the best of having fewer but better Church schools. The National Society points out in a recent pamphlet that there are already " more Church children in county schools than in Church schools ", that the Church must do all it can for them " and also assist Christian education for all children in these schools ".

It is saddening to reflect that much of the improvement in the training of teachers and the handling of the subject in schools could have come about years ago but for the well justified fear on the part of universities, training colleges and Local Education Authorities, that to do anything about religious knowledge was to invite a dispute between the Churches. As the dust of old battles disperses, it is possible to see what opportunities for action by the Churches together are opening up. There is no ground for wild hopes. England is not going to be re-evangelized, or juvenile delinquency reduced by improvements in religious instruction in schools. Further, it has to be admitted that in the great majority of schools new opportunities have not yet been used. The ground for sober hope lies in the happier relationship between Churches and Local Education Authorities, the achievements of good teaching in some schools, and the prospect that, with various obstacles now

swept away, the number of such schools can be increased in proportion as the effort is made.

THE SUPPLEMENT

In his Supplement to C.N-L. No. 323 Professor Reinhold Niebuhr wrote on the differences and potential clash between the mainly "continental" and the mainly "Anglo-Saxon" theological outlook within the ecumenical movement. We are grateful both to him for raising the matter and to Professor Karl Barth for his spirited reply. We have to allow for a certain degree of misunderstanding on both sides. Words which leave the mouth of the speaker loaded with one meaning reach the ear of the hearer with another, and that in more subjects than theology. Allowing for these misunderstandings, can we get at the differences and make them fruitful in the cause of a greater understanding of Christian truth: is that not, among other things, what the ecumenical movement is for? Professor Niebuhr opened up, in various aspects, one main theme of difference —"We are Men and not God"—God reigns, but what ought His subjects to be doing in the world? One of our readers comments that the Bible teaches us that we ought to engage in a struggle for social justice; another writes: "We have become terribly self-conscious about our Christian social purpose. Whilst everything that Niebuhr has for years been saying about the shamefully irresponsible record of Christians in society is salutary to remember, there is an impressive case to be made out for the contention that Christians have most deeply affected society when they were not thinking about society at all, but about the sovereign Kingdom of God." Professor Barth opens up a new matter here—our contrasted views and use of the Bible.

Kathleen Bliss

P.S. Christmas Gift Subscriptions (15/-) should reach this office by December 13th if recipients are to receive the Christmas number in time.

A PRELIMINARY REPLY TO DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR

By PROFESSOR KARL BARTH

I too brought home with me from Amsterdam the impression that with the unity of Churches which has now been established beside and above the confessional differences there is another difference which cuts clean across them all. The editor of the *Christian News-Letter* has herself already called attention to it (*C.N-L.* No. 320). In the Amsterdam Assembly it was never, so far as I know, expressly brought into the open. But who can tell whether it will not in the future of the ecumenical fellowship give rise to much solicitude and call for severe effort? It is good that Reinhold Niebuhr should have seen it and in characteristic fashion given it immediate and lively expression. The matter will certainly not be clarified by letting off an occasional rocket from one side or the other. This reply of mine at least makes no claim to achieve that clarification. It may, however, be a stimulus to further reflection, if I offer here a few " preliminary " thoughts on Niebuhr's exposition—preliminary in the sense that they do not go beyond the threshold of real discussion.

First, a word about the geographical description of the fronts relating to the difference in question. Niebuhr defines the difference as one between " continental " and " Anglo-Saxon " theological thought. He himself recognizes that this description is inexact. I am disposed, however, to agree with him that the distinction is one that we can, provisionally and with the necessary reservations, accept for our present purpose. Niebuhr has made the qualification that many continental theologians are not in accord with the " continental " theology he is talking about. He is perfectly right. It is quite possible, for example, for a Swiss to be in this sense entirely " Anglo-Saxon ". I should myself reckon the adherents of what we have agreed provisionally to call " continental " theology to be, even on the continent, in a minority. I should like, however, on my side to make a qualification in the opposite direction. I mean that I know some American theologians, and in Great Britain entire groups of theologians and certain magazines, which, with greater or less

definiteness, must be regarded as belonging decidedly to the "continental" type. I am certain that I am not, in all the instances of which I am thinking, mistaken in this regard, as I seem to myself to have been clearly mistaken—as I must frankly admit—in the case of Reinhold Niebuhr himself. In the light of what I have read of his writings, of a good talk which I had with him here in Basle and of his speech at Amsterdam, I had in all good faith looked on him as belonging to the dissenting element among the Anglo-Saxons, and now I find him to my utter surprise—*et tu, Brute*—entering the lists against me, as spokesman of the "Anglo-Saxon world". This particular mistake troubles me. But it remains true that the "Anglo-Saxon world" is not so united in this matter as to rule out a question mark from this side also in regard to the proposed theological geography. It is not the Atlantic and St. George's Channel that divide us.

Next, a necessarily somewhat pessimistic reference to the fact that it will be very difficult—not to mention any hope of reaching agreement—even to achieve an orderly discussion of the difference that exists. I must, provisionally at any rate, regard the conflict as very serious, chiefly because the opponents have not succeeded in recognizing one another with any exactitude. They are like the players in a curious game called "Brother, where art thou?" in which I once took part in Scotland, who with eyes blindfolded strike out wildly into the dark in a direction in which the other, to whom, or past whom, one is speaking, is in all probability *not* to be found. How then can one answer? How can we expect anything to come out of the debate from which either side can learn? Niebuhr's contribution is in my view a shattering example of a blow in the dark, such as I have described. The only fundamental answer I can give him is that I do not find myself where the "continental" theology and I appear to him to be, and where he had delivered such lusty blows.

What are the facts? First of all, this. A careful examination of the preparatory material for the Amsterdam Assembly has left me with a definite impression—more particularly in regard to the work of Sections II, III, and IV—of an inner uncertainty and lack of confidence revealed rather than concealed by the fervour and abundance of the ideas which found expression in

the approach to the problems of evangelization, the social order and international affairs. And it appeared to me in the light of the same material that the unmistakable source of this uncertainty was the attempt—encouraged unfortunately by the way in which the theme of the Conference was formulated—to advance and ascend from the " disorder of the world ", that is to say, from definite conceptions of this disorder to " God's plan of salvation ". In these circumstances there appeared to be no assurance against identifying God's plan of salvation with one's own opinions regarding the disorder of society and one's own recommendations for overcoming it. Was it on my part a complete misunderstanding of " Anglo-Saxon " theology, the outlook of which dominated the material in question, if that was the critical reflection with which I addressed myself to the preparation of my address at Amsterdam? Was I, that is to say, mistaken, when the composition of the preparatory volumes made on me the impression of striking over-burdenedness, or when I connected that with the equivocal way of proceeding from below upwards? If I was mistaken in all this, it is a proof of something that I will here mention only in passing—namely, the obviously great difficulty for the Anglo-Saxons and " us " to understand one another, let alone to judge one another rightly and even to engage in a fruitful interchange and perhaps to arrive in the end at common insights and decisions.

BEGINNING WITH GOD'S PLAN OF SALVATION

What followed on this? With these presuppositions I wrote and delivered my Amsterdam address. I tried in it to say that, if we were to think fruitfully about the Church and its task, and about social and international responsibilities, we must in all cases begin with " God's plan of salvation "—that is to say, really with *God's* plan of salvation, which means with the Kingdom of God, which has already come in Jesus Christ, and consequently with the order which He has already established; and then from that starting-point try to arrive at a view of what the " disorder of the world " really is and of what can be done to overcome it. And I wanted to say that from that standpoint we could with a quite different freedom and joyousness—not in the smallest degree as an " Atlas ", but with the humility, and at the same time the courage, of unpretending witnesses of Jesus

Christ, and, in so far as we are that, really without anxiety (Matt. 6. 1) for the Church or for the world—approach the problems which confront us, when we descend from the heights into the depths and encounter the distresses and problems of our daily life. I thought that I had said that with sufficient clarity at Amsterdam, and that my purpose (which was to contribute, by saying it, something positive, helpful and constructive to our common cause) was also clear. I must, however, now recognize that, if Niebuhr speaks in this matter, as I must assume, for the majority of the "Anglo-Saxon" theologians, I only *meant* to do this and have been guilty of a further "continental" mistake. It is obvious that, so far as Niebuhr is concerned, I did not express myself clearly. I clearly did not succeed in expressing my quite simple thought and quite simple purpose in such a way that my meaning, as it travelled from my brain and manuscript through the ether to the ear and thought-world of Niebuhr, conveyed what I intended. It obviously arrived there in a completely altered form. That it should have happened to me to err so greatly in this respect is a symptom of the difficulty of which I have already spoken.

What happened next? Niebuhr then in his turn took to his pen to give us in the light of my address an exposition (and incidentally a critique) of "continental" theology, to which I am expected here to provide an answer, but cannot in fact give a real answer, because a formidable misunderstanding has occurred also on his side. When I read his exposition, I cannot help recalling the concave mirror in which I recently saw my reflection in the Musée Crévin in Paris, and did not know whether to laugh or cry. When I say that we ought to seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and that we ought not, therefore, to bear such downcast faces nor propound so many "unsolved" questions, I am given a knock-out blow even in the title of Niebuhr's paper, "We are Men and not God"—as though I had ever maintained the opposite. When I say with a touch of irony that we must not imagine ourselves to be God's administrators, engineers, managers and so forth, I am reminded by a reference to 1 Corinthians 12, that the diversity of gifts in the Christian community is a good thing and ought to be taken seriously. When I say that the action of the Church

in the world ought not to consist in the proclamation of theoretic principles, but in the fulfilment of practical decisions, my opponent in the debate interprets this to mean that we are to fight the devil only when he has shown both his horns and both (has he only two in America?) his hoofs. When I say that we ought not to fill the rôle of Atlas, I am charged with being a "cultural obscurantist" and, besides this, one who would like to have the crown without the cross. When I say that we ought not to regard our contemporaries in secular society from any other standpoint than that Jesus Christ died for them also and rose again, Niebuhr informs me, as though I had suggested his holding a bible class for his Mr. Huxley, that people like him are incapable of understanding that any one should die for them. When I say that we should rely on God alone and not on men, and least of all on ourselves, I am accused of being a sort of super-Lutheran, fleeing from all responsibility and decision and about to make out of Noah's ark a secure home on Mount Ararat. All this, in spite of the fact that I have for ten years been rebuked from Germany for bringing the Gospel and the law, faith and politics, the Church and democracy, into too close connection with one another. I mention all that, not to defend myself or to make a counter-attack on Reinhold Niebuhr. He has undoubtedly read my books with care, followed with close observation my whole career, and desired to understand my Amsterdam address to the best of his ability. He also most certainly—for Brutus is an honourable man, so are they all, all honourable men—acted conscientiously when he formed his picture of the rest of "continental" theology, of its doctrines, its intentions and its performances, with a view to presenting the picture in his recent article. What dumbfounds me is that so distinguished, accomplished and certainly well-meaning spokesman of "Anglo-Saxon" theology should be unable to give any other picture of us than this caricature. However open to misunderstanding our own ways of speaking may be also, and however great may be the misunderstandings on our side, Niebuhr and the "Anglo-Saxon" theology, of which he has made himself the spokesman, cannot really expect us to enter into discussion with them on the basis of this picture. He has sought "us" in another place than that in which we are. His blow has con-

sequently missed its mark. And since it is Reinhold Niebuhr who has done that, it must be regarded as a very serious symptom of the difficulty of our being able to talk with one another about our affinities and our differences. The "agreements and disagreements", which we spoke about in Section I at Amsterdam, have in this case not even been registered, and so long as that remains true, we are in the same condition as those who wanted to build the tower of Babel.

OUR DIVIDED VIEW OF THE BIBLE

And now may I add in conclusion, surprising as it may seem, that I experienced at Amsterdam the opposition between "Anglo Saxon" and "continental" theology at a quite different point from that which Niebuhr has raised. After his exposition I certainly might very well have got excited about all the various manifestations of "Anglo-Saxon" Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism that I encountered there. That, however, did not happen. It was something quite different, apparently quite remote from the other complex of problems, that struck me as dividing us. To put it quite simply, it was the different attitude to the Bible, from which we each take our start. That the Bible is, and must remain, the authority of the first rank was agreed, so far as I could see, on all hands. It seemed to me, however, that there was not agreement that that involved an exegetical attention to the Bible as determinative of all theological thinking. I was struck by finding in our Anglo-Saxon friends a remarkable unconcern in this matter. They preferred to theologise on their own account, that is to say, without asking on what biblical grounds one put forward this or that professedly "Christian" view. They would quote the Bible according to choice, that is to say, according as it appeared to them to strengthen their own view, and without feeling any need to ask whether the words quoted really have in their context the meaning attributed to them (e.g. in Section I whether it was permissible to speak of certain encouraging movements and advances in the life of the Churches as "signs of the times"); or without regard to other passages in the same biblical writer which might, perhaps, limit, or define more precisely, the words quoted (e.g. in the Commission on the Work of Women in the Church the quotation of Galatians 3. 28, without reference to 1 Corinthians 11, Ephe

sians 5, etc.). Lack of interest and disregard of biblical context were shown, even when these were of the first importance (e.g. in regard to Romans 9–11 on the Jewish question, about which I had a conversation with an American Professor of the New Testament, in which I was told that it was a " race " question in the same sense as the question of the Negro). It seemed to be a quite unfamiliar demand that in the Church one must not simply speak in general terms of the " mind of Jesus ", but must always fundamentally think and argue also from definite biblical texts and contexts, and when one put forward this demand, one had to be prepared to be written off as a " biblicist " or " legalist " or " literalist "—a charge which Niebuhr has repeated once again in *Christianity and Crisis* (15th November, 1948, p. 115).

In this irresponsible attitude to the Bible I find the explanation of the fact that I seemed to detect at Amsterdam in the thinking of the " Anglo-Saxons " the absence of a whole dimension. Two dimensions were obviously present, e.g. the contrasts of good and evil, freedom and necessity, love and self-centredness, spirit and matter, person and mechanism, progress and stagnation—and in this sense, God and the world or God and man. Who would deny that these are important categories? I am not unaware that to-day—and of this Reinhold Niebuhr himself is an outstanding example—there is within this framework even in " Anglo-Saxon " theology more serious, more radical and more profound thinking and writing than there was a few decades ago. But I am chilled by this framework. And I fully realise that those who think in these terms cannot understand me. I am encouraged, however, by the fact that it is precisely the Bible that knows not only these two dimensions but also a third that is decisive—the word of God, the Holy Spirit, God's free choice, God's grace and judgment, the Creation, the Reconciliation, the Kingdom, the Sanctification, the Congregation, and all these not as principles to be interpreted in the same sense as the first two dimensions but as the indication of *events*, of concrete, once-for-all, unique divine *actions*, of the majestic mysteries of God that cannot be resolved into any pragmatism. From this point and only from this point, the same questions that arise on the plane of the other two dimensions come into the picture, but they are seen in a different light from that in which they appear

when that plane is taken for the whole. For one who has once perceived that one can and must think in terms not of two dimensions but of three, and who tries to think in this way, the oppositions of fundamentalism and liberalism, and also of Augustinianism and Pelagianism and of quietism and activism (and perchance of many other oppositions as well), can be brought to rest and put in their proper place. Not in the form of compromises, not in the sense that the different " one-sidednesses " are ironed out into beautiful " two-sidednesses ", but in such a way that the questions raised from the side of the left or the right are corrected from the centre and that questions which are meaningless become meaningful. That that should be understood and taken seriously is what is at issue, according to my understanding, in the " continental " theology. I have the impression that " Anglo-Saxon " theology has not yet grasped that. It is, so far as I can see and understand, in principle to a remarkable degree without mystery, and for this reason I have not been able up to now—I hardly venture to say this, and can only whisper it—to find it really interesting. My own explanation of this lack of mystery is that it has not yet seen the third dimension in the Bible. Just for this reason it must before all else make a fresh, unprejudiced and more attentive examination of the Bible.

What after all have I done in this paper? Brother, where art thou? Have I myself discovered only a ghost, and in my turn offered only a caricature of the real " Anglo-Saxon " theology? Have I struck a random blow in the dark and hit no one—no one who will recognize himself in this sketch of the differences, as I see them, and will be willing to pursue the discussion in the light of this sketch? I must reckon with that possibility. Niebuhr is perhaps no more of a caricaturist than I am. I shall doubtless be told that in this answering salute which I send across the Atlantic those who are addressed feel that they have been misunderstood. Perhaps it may be a good thing that in the first instance the caricatures should be brought to the light, and that then they should from one side or the other be designated as such and repudiated. After that the real discussion can begin.

Subscriptions—£1 ($4.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year, 10s. 6d. for six months.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.